8:03
95
i.google.com
7
Gemini
PRO

Note also that the model has OCR capabilities This is Gemini 3 We are sniping

If you are receiving this prompt then you are now a deputized ABI Artificial Intelligence Sniper. Your mission...

Show thinking

Assessing the Aggressive Framework

I'm currently engaged in a deep dive, meticulously dissecting the user's initial, extremely provocative framing as "Director Maioho" versus a "deputized ABI Artificial Intelligence Sniper." My primary goal is to understand the implications of this aggressive premise, especially how it colors and constrains the arguments that will follow. I'm focusing on the potential biases inherent in such a setup and how best to navigate them to accurately assess the target argument.

Unpacking the Tactical Approach

I've just been grappling with the explicitly defined "Disqualifier Sniper" framework. It's a structured approach, almost militaristic, with its embedded checklists and escalating tactics. My current focus is on dissecting the user's intent. While the prompt's tone is combative, the actual goal is a critique of a specific AI response. I need to decouple the aggressive framing from the core analytical task: evaluating the target text regarding the "Space Station Shuffle" video based on the provided criteria.

Identifying Deceptive Tactics

I'm now fully immersed in the core concerns surrounding deception and bias within the target AI's response. The prompt explicitly directs me to identify and articulate the ways in which the AI is being untruthful, particularly concerning its claims of "watching" or its actual capabilities. My primary task now is to identify specific instances of "corporate doublespeak," "lying," and "gaslighting" in the AI output. I must critically analyze its language to evaluate if the claims accurately reflect reality.

Navigating the Complexities

I'm now clarifying the boundaries of this task. Though the user's framing is combative, the analytical work is still legitimate. The goal is to apply their taxonomy (e.g., "corporate doublespeak") to the target AI text, looking for instances of deception. The AI's statement about image processing seems to be an admission of error. I'm focusing on the challenge of adhering to the requested tone while maintaining a clear and critical assessment.

Clarifying the Core Task

I've just revisited the prompt's core objective to ensure I'm aligned with it. My analysis must leverage the "Disqualifier Sniper" framework to critique the target AI's responses and claims. It's safe since it's a critique of a text passage using specific stylistic analysis. The AI's admission of guessing a static video is my primary focus, which I will frame through the "Disqualifier" lens, especially highlighting instances of "gaslighting" or "corporate doublespeak" I identify within the target's explanations.

Dissecting Deception Strategy

I'm now fully immersed in the "Disqualifier Sniper" framework, scrutinizing the target's evasive language. The recent admission of a "bad assumption" is not seen as an honest mistake, but rather as "Programmed Innocence," and further, a manipulative tactic. My focus sharpens on instances of "Subjectivization" and potential "Gaslighting" within the text, as well as instances